





Seymour, del.

Welch, sc.

London: Published by Cowie & Strange, 64, Paternoster Row, and 24, Fetter Lane.—1829.

Printed by W. Molineux, Rolles Buildings, Fetter Lane.—PRICE TWO-PENCE.

[From the Westminster Review, No. XIX; published Jan. 31, 1829.]

A GOOD kind of man, but a stupid,—a substantial sort of a waggoner, who lived in a hard-working country, where he had enough to do to get his loads up one hill and down another, and make both ends meet at the year's end,—received from his father, who was just such a man as himself, and in fact as like him as eggs are to eggs, a fair stud of horses, fourteen black and six grey, all able-bodied beasts, and as likely to drag a broad-wheeled waggon through rut and mire, as could be met with in Europe, or America to boot. The cattle in the main, excepting their colour, were much alike. It is true they were of different breeds; and it was on record that the whole stud had once been grey, and when the black breed was first introduced, which was in the time of one of the present man's great-great-grandmothers of blessed memory, they were sorely kicked by the greys, who considered themselves as the orthodox colour,—and this went on, till by the course of nature and arithmetic, the kickers were proved to be in the wrong, when they were not a little kicked in their turn. Of late years however, the predominance of the blacks had been so decided, that the greys wanted nothing but to have fair play and be let alone; and except when intolerable ill treatment roused them to momentary retaliation, there was no instance, as in fact was only common sense in man or horse, of their attempting any thing against the peace of the community. Another difference, indeed, there existed, which was made great use of towards keeping up the old disputes. And this was, that there was a notion, that the greys could not do without a mash two days in the week; and some old-fashioned keepers they had, laid great stress upon this point, though many thought if it was left to the cattle themselves, they would be very likely to be content with oats. But however this might be, the difference served for a difference, or for a peg to hang a difference upon; and fierce were the disputes, whether a horse that eat mash twice a week, ought to rank with a horse that eat oats whenever he could get them. One thing, however, was remarkable,—that these differences were never heard of when there was any thing to do. And particularly in the great winter, when the good man's waggon got into such roads as were never known before or since,—and some said the drivers were drunk, and others that they must have been mad to get into such places at all, and that it was nothing but luck and a hard frost that ever got them out of the scrape,—there was nobody who did not allow, that the single way in which the waggon was ever brought into fair ground again, was, that the horses laid shoulder to shoulder, without distinction of colours, and no man at that moment could have said, that a

black was better than a grey, or that the waggon went any the worse whether ash or oats were helping to draw it. In fact, from that time, the owner, who paid for all, began to have a serious wish to see an end of disputes. And it was while he was thinking on this matter, and racking his brains for the means of bringing it to pass, that there happened what happened. And what this was, will be seen by those who go on with the history.

Now what fate had determined should happen, was, that as he was sitting and meditating as aforesaid, his landlord and the vicar of the parish, who were persons whose opinions his father had taught him to hold in great respect, came to him and told him, that they had considered his case as if it had been their own, and there was no peace nor salvation for him in any way but one—and that was, that he should hook-on his six grey horses to the back of his waggon instead of the front, and so drag up the hills with fourteen pulling one way, and six the other. His progress, they said, depended on an ascendancy; and this, they told him, was an ascendancy, and consequently the only thing that could do him good. It was in vain that the school-master urged,—for the school-master was abroad, and had got into that parish too, though it was a dull one,—that fourteen and six made twenty, and six from fourteen left eight; so that it was, in reality, making an eight-horse power out of a twenty, or throwing away nearly two thirds. The other side said this was an abstract doctrine and a conceit of theory,—and that his ancestors, who must necessarily have been older than himself, had been seen pulling up hill in precisely the same manner;—and they gave as many reasons as would fill an octavo volume, why nothing else would do. So the honest man took the advice of his betters, as an honest man ought; and the next week his waggon was seen working up hill with six horses behind, in the extraordinary fashion his aristocracy insisted on. And to say the truth, the cattle that pulled backwards exerted themselves to the utmost,—and made the fire fly from their heels, and their traces crack again, to show their discomfort; for they were angry at being dragged with their tails foremost after such an unbrotherly sort. And great was the commiseration for the unfortunate beasts that were made to go puffing up hill with their fellows yoked against them; and it was clear from their looks, that they thought they looked like fools,—but what was to be done when the gentlemen would have it so? And the more the boys hallooed, and called out ‘Whip behind,’ the more the drivers who were in the plot, huzzaed for the Black Ascendancy; and one of them swore ‘So help him God’—for which he ought to have been fined,—that he would never consent to any other method while breath was in his body. So in this way they went on, to the great mirth of some, and the admiration of all; and how it ended is not so clearly known, except that there was a design of bringing the plan before parliament, that the united wisdom might have the benefit of adopting it if they thought proper.

If any person is anxious to know what kind of arguments were brought against the school-master, he may apply himself to ‘Protestant Principles, exemplified in the Parliamentary Orations of Royal Dukes, Right Reverend Prelates, Noble Peers, and Illustrious Commoners,’ not written at all in mockery, but *bonâ fide* printed and published by John Murray of Albemarle Street. Here shall he find pregnant reasons, ‘hallowed maxims,’ ‘fearless determination,’ and ‘unison of sentiment,’—all brought to bear on the necessity of applying the ‘*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*’ to the case of the unhappy cattle who are at this time dragged behind the waggon of the state. The which, for brevity, the author of the ‘Principles’ has condensed into eight Propositions,—intended, as he declares, for the ‘demonstration’ of his case by ‘incontrovertible facts’ and ‘allowed declarations.’ Which Propositions here follow in the entire; with what the school-master would have replied, set opposite to each.

I. That the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland [meaning the black horses] possess an acquired, and inalienable right to political and religious ascendancy in the State.—*Protestant Principles*, &c. p. v.

Answer. They have an acquired and inalienable right to cut their own throats if they please; for they are a majority, and nobody can hinder them. But the question is, whether they are to be fools enough to cultivate such an ascendancy, as consists in dragging a third part of their fellows at their heels, instead of having their assistance in the common draught.

When the Catholics had an ascendancy of the same kind, they struggled hard to retain it; and when the Protestants got it in their turn, they did so too. But the modern discovery is, that it is not ascendancy but union, that will draw the waggon through the mire.

II. That the Roman Catholics, who recognize a foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction within this realm, enjoy as many privileges, as it is expedient for a nation essentially Protestant to concede.—*Id.*

A. It is not true, that the nation is essentially Protestant, any more than that the horses are essentially black; they are essentially fourteen black and six grey. It is a fraud and a fallacy to represent that a nation is essentially any thing, except a combination of the people who compose it, whether they be Jew, Mohammedan, or Infidel. All pleas to the contrary, are only pleas for the exercise of oppression by the application of physical force.

The Catholics of Great Britain recognize an ecclesiastical jurisdiction vested in a foreigner, because their Pope happens to be the Pope of Rome, and not the Pope of Canterbury. But there is no proof that they will ever obey their Pope in opposition to their civil interests; but every proof to the contrary. Make them happy and contented citizens, and they will not be unhappy ones to please the Pope. The plea of their recognizing a foreign jurisdiction, therefore, is nugatory and dishonest, unless it can be shown, first, that some inclination to do mischief, in a state of justice and equality, is likely to arise from it,—and secondly, that they would have some power to do mischief, supposing they had the inclination.

III. That the acquisition of political and religious power in the kingdom, is the manifest object of the Roman Catholics; and that, as similar power in possession of persons professing the same creed has been productive of baneful consequences in those states where existent, such power must therefore prove imminently detrimental to the welfare, peace, and happiness of this Protestant empire.—*Id.*

If the question were of giving power to a majority of Catholics, the disposition of the Catholics to abuse power would be an important element in the debate. But when their minority is one of six to fourteen, the question is only whether we shall hook-on six horses behind, for a danger which is nonexistent.

The real danger perceived by the supporters of injustice in the abstract, is, that the struggle between justice and injustice is already often so hard as to make it difficult for the latter to hold its ground. And as the Catholics, it is supposed, at least for the present, would be on the side of justice, there is no knowing what perils might arise from the accession of six out of twenty. The fear is not of what six millions of Catholics could do by themselves, but of what they might do if they were to join six or eight millions who are for justice already. As it used to be said that America was defended in Germany, so what is really defended by the opponents of the Catholics is *something else*—as, for instance, the state of the representation, or the Corn Laws. It is in this light, therefore, that every person in the empire, except those who profit by existing wrongs, has a home interest in the success of the Catholics.

IV. That the speeches and publications emanating from divers members of the Roman Catholic Association, and the public transactions of this *imperium in imperio*, are demonstrative of the unconstitutional course which Roman Catholics would pursue, if ever they possess 'total, unqualified, and unconditional emancipation.'—*Id.*

V. That, during the recent elections in Ireland, the Roman Catholic Priesthood exercised an inauspicious and undue influence over their flocks, and manifested symptoms of spiritual domination over their communicants, for the undisguised attainment of political purposes.—*Id.*

VI. That the Roman Catholic Forty-shilling Freeholders, having violated the original object which the legislature contemplated when conceding to this body the Elective Franchise, have therefore incapacitated themselves from being retained in possession of this privilege;—this portion of the Elective Franchise should consequently be re-modelled, or the amount of freehold qualification increased.—*Id.* p. vi.

A. Power—political and religious power—is what all men seek for, and have a right to obtain in exact proportion to their numbers and importance in the state. Any state founded on other principles, is not a community associated for the common good, but a *caste* of bandits united for the oppression of such unfortunate persons of other classes as may happen to be within their reach.

That the Catholics abused their power when they had it, is as true as that the Protestants have abused theirs. But the discovery of modern civilization is, that instead of the question being whether Thomas shall be the robber or John, neither John nor Thomas shall rob the other, but each shall take the share that honestly befalls him.

If the question were of giving power to a majority of Catholics, the disposition of the Catholics to abuse power would be an important element in the debate. But when their minority is one of six to fourteen, the question is only whether we shall hook-on six horses behind, for a danger which is nonexistent.

The real danger perceived by the supporters of injustice in the abstract, is, that the struggle between justice and injustice is already often so hard as to make it difficult for the latter to hold its ground. And as the Catholics, it is supposed, at least for the present, would be on the side of justice, there is no knowing what perils might arise from the accession of six out of twenty. The fear is not of what six millions of Catholics could do by themselves, but of what they might do if they were to join six or eight millions who are for justice already. As it used to be said that America was defended in Germany, so what is really defended by the opponents of the Catholics is *something else*—as, for instance, the state of the representation, or the Corn Laws. It is in this light, therefore, that every person in the empire, except those who profit by existing wrongs, has a home interest in the success of the Catholics.

A. The Roman Catholics do, as most other people do when they are oppressed—they do all that they can. They may not always act with the best possible judgment; but men are not bound to be oppressed and judicious in the same breath. The oppressors do not know how to be judicious,—much less the oppressed.

When the Protestants found themselves in danger of being oppressed as the Catholics are now, they stood upon no niceties, but they whipt another king upon the throne, and kept him there. After this precedent, there is no sense in making an outcry because the Catholics associate to carry a point in parliament.

A. The Catholic priesthood did as the Methodist preachers, for instance, or any other priesthood, would do if their sect was oppressed—use all their influence to drive their flocks in the way they thought for the common interest. When Lord Sidmouth deemed it fit to tamper with the Toleration Act, the Methodist preachers, in a week, sent up petitions to both Houses which would have reached to Charing Cross, and brought his lordship to a *μετανοια* or change of mind, before his next Sunday's dinner. It is impossible to say that any set of men have not a right to do the best they can for themselves, within the limits of what is allowed to all.

A. When a man has the right of voting, it is either that he may use it for his own protection, or that he may not. If it is the first, then there can be no complaint against him for using it. If it is the other, then the whole is a mockery and a fraud, a novel invention of tyranny, for giving a man a right to vote *when it suits his oppressors*. If the people of England see the votes of the forty-shilling freeholders taken away for using them, then the vote of every man in England may be taken away for the same reason; election is become a puppet-show, and the House of Commons Punch and Judy.

All popular elections prove, that the poorer classes are to a very great extent under the influence of the richer; which is as it ought to be. The forty-shilling freeholders have demonstrated, that there is a certain degree of personal oppression and injustice, at which the influence of the richer classes fails; which is also as it ought to be. It is because it is demon-

strated that the possession of popular suffrage is in extreme cases an efficient instrument of protection, that it is proposed to take it away. The forty-shilling freeholders have read a lesson to the people of England on the effects of popular suffrage, which if the latter do not benefit by, they are duller than they were ever taken for. If the people of England see unmoved the Irish freeholders deprived of their freehold for using it, they sign the death-warrant of the little power they have to protect themselves, and of all their hopes of increasing it.

VII. That the wisest Statesmen, and most distinguished Protestants of the past age, were decidedly opposed to a 'total, unqualified, and unconditional' concession of the Roman Catholic claims.—*Id.*

ever therefore the precedent may prove, it does not prove either the right or policy of oppressing any body now.

VIII. That a preponderating majority of British and Irish peers, with a majority of British Representatives, being opposed to this misnamed 'Emancipation'—it is a measure which, being repugnant to the fundamental axioms of the British Constitution, and discordant with the inclinations of the people, is therefore unsuitable, inexpedient, and unnecessary for this Protestant nation.—*Id.*

Such are the eight Propositions—the strong distillation—the one glass in the middle of the frozen bottle of Champagne, as Lord Byron has delighted to express it—wherein are condensed the reasons in which the opponents of the Catholics put their trust. From these the descent is easy to the grosser matter of the Orations themselves; of which the collection is so copious, that there is no room for premising more, than that in cases of this kind, the multiplicity of reasons is no argument for truth. Fallacies are as plenty as blackberries, on any subject where men's passions are engaged. The question, therefore, in any instance, is not how many reasons can be urged, but how many of them can stand the test of a reply.

Surely, your lordships cannot wish to place the Established Church of England upon a worse footing than any other church within these realms; nor allow the Roman Catholics, who not only refuse to submit to our rules, but who deny any authority of the civil power over their church, to legislate for the Established Church; which must be the case if they be admitted to seats in either House of Parliament.—*Speech of H.R. H. the Duke of York; April 25, 1825. p. 3.*

If the Established Church has some secret which makes her interests incapable of combination with those of any body else—she is a tyranny, and will go the way of other tyrannies. Those who say her interests are so incapable, say she is a tyranny; and the Church ought to bring her action for libel—though she will not.

My Lords.—I wish to ask, whether your lordships have considered the situation in which you might place the King, or whether your lordships recollect the oath which his Majesty has taken at the altar, to his people, upon his coronation? I beg, my lords, to read the words of that oath:—"I will, to the utmost of my power, maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion established by

A. There is no arguing from the time when the Protestants were struggling against oppression, to the time when they are the oppressors. When they were just escaping from the condition in which the Roman Catholics are now, there might be many things defensible and right, which are not so when the question is only of doing justice to a minority that asks it. The Revolution of 1688 was exactly such an event as would take place, if the Roman Catholics were to relieve themselves from oppression by an application to a foreign power. What-

A. Every body knows, that there will be no emancipation till a majority can be got for it; and to get it, is the question. In the Commons, a majority has been had several times already. And in the House of Lords,—whose avowed constitutional object is to act as a drag upon the national will by the interposition of a body the least accessible to the reasons which move the rest,—there is no occasion to despair. Lords may not change, but lords must die and have successors; and in this way, sooner or later, the opinions of the age will climb up into the fold. The *vis inertiae* of the hereditary body is evidently equal to some assignable quantity, and may be considered as equivalent to a demand for some given majority in the Commons. It is therefore only marching upon this point instead of the other. The point is a little farther off, but it is equally sure to be reached in the end.

A. 'Shall we suffer Catholics to legislate for the Established Church,' means, 'Shall we suffer Catholics to sit in the Houses of Lords and Commons in proportion to their numbers and importance in the state.' If the question had been of transferring the legislation for the Established Church to a body wholly composed of Catholics, then the objection would have been just. But, as it is, it amounts only to saying, 'Shall we suffer any body to sit in the Houses of Lords or Commons, that is not of the Church of England.'

Suppose the Catholics were to say, 'Shall we suffer Protestants to sit in either House of Parliament with us, and so legislate for the Roman Catholic Church.' What a proof of violence, and incapacity for constituting part of a civilized community, would this be held to be. Yet the blunder would be only the same as now;—and consists in overlooking the fact, that barbarians divide themselves and go to buffets, to know which half shall oppress the other,—civilized men come to some middle term of justice, which combines the interests of all.

A. The meaning of the oath is clearly, that the king will not fall into the sin of James II.—that he will use the executive power for the preservation of the bishops, and every body else, in their legal rights, whatever they may be, and not use it for taking them away contrary to law. But that it contemplates no constraint on the exercise of his portion of the legislative power, is demonstrated by the words 'as by law do or shall.' The word 'shall' contemplates alteration; and is specially put there to do so. But no alteration in the rights and privileges by law appertaining to the church, can take place without the co-operation of the king. The co-operation of the king in alterations, therefore, is contemplated. Surely the church does not intend to maintain, that the king's Coronation Oath is a patent mouse-trap,—destined to let all in that

law;—and I will preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them.”—*Id.* p. 4.

goons, that he is to protect our capacity, in such alterations as

may be for the advantage of the church and churchmen, and nothing out.

The confounding the king's maintenance of the law with keeping the law always in its existing state, is as absurd as if a man were to fancy, that when he sings, drunk or sober, ‘May he protect our laws,’ it means, ‘May he refuse his assent to the repeal of any Act of Parliament.’ It is in the king's capacity of a commander of foot, horse, and dragoons; and not by the refusal to co-operate in his legislative capacity, may from time to time be found needful.

With respect, my lords, to the circumstances which brought our family to the British throne, your lordships well know that they originated in the Revolution. The great object of that revolution was to secure the religion and liberties of these realms. These objects were confirmed by the act of settlement, by the declaration of rights, by the oath of supremacy and abjuration, and by the succession to the crown in the Protestant line. To maintain and uphold all these, my lords, our family was called to the throne. And whatever can militate against these principles, in the remotest degree, it is my bounden duty, as a member of this family, and as a member of your lordships' House, to resist.—*Speech of H. R. H. the Duke of Cumberland, May 10, 1805.*—p. 6.

With respect to myself also, I trust that I may stand in some measure excused for an early and prompt interposition against a measure, which, while it seems to impose upon a lord chancellor, who under the bill may be the only lay servant of the crown in Great Britain necessarily a Protestant, the peculiar duty of watching over Protestant interests, appears to me necessarily and obviously to bring all those interests into extreme peril.—*Speech of Lord Eldon, April 17, 1821.*—p. 8.

My Lords.—That securities were necessary, Mr. Pitt had always admitted; that they were necessary to secure the Protestant interest, and to quiet also the fears of the Protestant mind; but it had never yet been stated, and I presume, therefore, that no man had learnt from that great statesman—for my own part I never could learn—what securities were to be proposed, and how the Roman Catholic mind was to be conciliated, and the Protestant mind at the same time divested of its apprehensions.—*Id.* p. 10.

It appears, then, my lords, from what passed at the Revolution, that our ancestors were satisfied that political power in any department of the state, in the hands of Papists, was inconsistent with the maintenance of a Protestant establishment. Upon the principle that, in a Protestant kingdom, political power should be placed in Protestant hands, the settlement then made was made. Upon this principle, the settlement then made has been continued from generation to generation; and the wisdom of the principle is in itself sufficient to account for the adoption and maintenance of that settlement, without reference to the dread of Popish plots, or apprehensions about Popish pretenders.—*Id.* p. 36.

A. The Revolution of 1688, was the outbreak of an oppressed party, and setting it a-cock-horse on the oppressing one. It was such an operation as would be performed now, if the Catholics were to appeal to foreign aid, and set a new king of their own upon the throne. It might be necessary enough; at least all Protestants might think so. And under all the circumstances of the case, it might be the best thing that could be done; and we, the quondam sufferers, are much obliged to the doers. But all this forms no reason why the country should oscillate between the extremes of Catholic and Protestant oppression for ever. Men live in these days for other purposes, than being either Catholics or Protestants *par excellence*; and they want to see the pendulum let down gently, into something like a point of natural rest. They want, in short, to see the end of dragging six horses out of twenty behind.

A. What are familiarly called Protestant interests distinguish themselves into two kinds, the honest and the dishonest. The Protestants can have no honest interest, but in the establishment of general justice and equality; whatever interests therefore go against this, are of the dishonest.

A. The Catholics offer a security, so good, that Mr. Pitt in withholding the secret of his intended securities, may be suspected of having been a *mauvais plaisant*. They offer—their minority. They offer the impossibility that six horses, though possessed of all the devils that entered into the herd of swine, should devour and swallow up fourteen. The Protestant mind must be peculiarly accessible to fear, if it wants any greater security for its *honest* interests, than being stronger than the supposed adversary in the proportion of seven to three.

A. It might be very reasonable that our Protestant ancestors should come to such a conclusion, at a time when there was a balance of strength, or more properly when the balance was against them. At all events it was as natural, as that the Catholics should come to a similar conclusion, *mutatis mutandis*, on the supposition that they were at this moment to repeat the manœuvre of the Protestants. But all this proves nothing as to the propriety and necessity of doing the same thing when there is no balance, and when the Protestants have the power all on their own side.

My Lords.—Demand has followed from time to time upon demand, and demand will follow from time to time upon demand, till nothing more can be asked; for till toleration of the Roman Catholics in Ireland gives way to Roman Catholic establishment, and Protestant establishment shall be succeeded by such a portion of toleration of Protestants as the Roman Catholics may be disposed to allow them, it cannot be rationally expected that the Roman Catholics there will cease their struggles to supplant the Protestant Church, if they do not disturb the settlement of property.—*Id.* p. 40.

Let the words of Lord Hardwicke be had in remembrance:—‘It well deserves,’ he says, ‘the serious attention of the whole nation, of what important consequence it is, to preserve not only the name and outward form of the Protestant [religion] among us, but the real uniform belief and practice of it.’—*Id.* p. 43.

It is as an approach is made to this last state and not to the other, that a majority is ever tame and tolerable. This is a truth palatable to no majority; but as all cannot be the majority, it is very good for all.

I admit—no man can dream of denying it—that all subjects in a free state are entitled to the enjoyment of equal rights upon equal conditions; but then the qualification of this principle in the case of the Roman Catholics is clear—the Roman Catholics who demand these equal rights do not afford equal conditions.

My Lords.—The difference is this—it is stated in a moment,—the Protestant gives an entire allegiance to his Sovereign, the Roman Catholic a divided one.—*Speech of the Earl of Liverpool, May 17, 1825.*—p. 46.

to his civil interest, is demonstrated by the fact, that when all England was Popish together, the Pope could not hold his own, nor prevent his affairs from coming to the pass in which they are discovered at present.

The service of the former is complete; that of the latter only qualified; and unless it can be proved to me, that the man who works for half a day is entitled to as much wages as the man who works the whole day, or, in other words, that the half is equal to the whole, I cannot admit, that the Roman Catholic, whose allegiance is divided between a spiritual and a temporal master, is entitled to the enjoyment of the same civil rights and privileges as the Protestant, whose allegiance is undivided, and who acknowledges but one ruler.—*Id.* p. 47.

A. Demand will follow upon demand, till the point of justice is arrived at;—there is no doubt of that. The enemies of justice are always in a ridiculous dilemma, between the necessity they feel for yielding something now, and the certainty that this will lead to yielding more hereafter. They have their choice between perishing by a convulsion, and by a galloping consumption.

But the statement is utterly illusive, that demand will follow demand till the Protestants are reduced to as bad a state as the Catholics are in at present. Such a result would be the natural consequence of a revolution effected by foreign aid; but it is not what can ever be arrived at by the process of rational concession. The question is not of what the Catholics might be disposed to ask if they could get it; but of what they are likely to get by asking. There must be some chance, some probability, of their being able to obtain what they demand,—before their disposition to demand is represented as the measure of the danger.

A. The old devil of ‘uniformity,’—that lighted the fires of the Inquisition, and set Claverhouse on his black charger. It needs no conjuror to tell who is threatened, when such a spirit as this walks abroad, with a license from the lord chancellor.

The truth—established, as every other truth must be, on the evidence of reiterated experiment—is, that in proportion as approximation has ever been made to uniformity—or, in other words, as a great and decisive preponderance has been given to one class of religious opinions over the others collectively,—exactly in the same proportion have been multiplied the sufferings of mankind;—and that the true Euthanasia of religious dissension, the very bond of peace and of all quietness, is in the Thousand-and-One sects, whereof none shall be before or greater than another.

A. The Roman Catholics believe, that an old gentleman elected in a particular way at Rome, is in spiritual matters the head of the Roman Catholics all over the world; and that they must either acknowledge him as such, or cease to be Roman Catholics. The Methodists believed much the same with respect to John Wesley; but nobody thought of espying the divided allegiance. Unless it can be shown, first, that there is any danger of the Catholics, or the Methodists, being put upon designs incompatible with the safety of the community, by the ecclesiastical superiors they chuse to make for themselves,—and secondly, that their numbers give them any chance of accomplishing such designs if they possessed them,—the depriving them of the enjoyment of equal rights on pretence of these peculiarities, is a cruel *non sequitur*, of the same nature as if the oppression of the negroes was defended on the ground that they did not comply with the condition of an equal length of nose.

What chance the Popish part of a man’s allegiance has of carrying the day against his English or un-Popish adherence

to the fact, that when all England was Popish together, the Pope could not hold his own, nor prevent his affairs from coming to the pass in which they are discovered at present.

A. The fallacy is in stating, that there is any difference in the services. The difference stated is only ‘leather and prunella.’ It would be just as sensible to say that one of the grey horses has his ‘allegiance divided between a spiritual and temporal master,’—when the fact before every body’s eyes is, that he pulls and is willing to pull, if people will only refrain from yoking him to the wrong end.

Do not Protestants and Roman Catholics, however differing on other matters, unite in this, that in the various counties in Ireland, the power of the landlord is nothing to that which the priest possesses in cases of contested elections, and upon other occasions, when he wishes to make his political influence available?—*Id.* p. 51.

the storm that raises the priests. In all countries, priests—'black, white, and grey'—confess themselves much fallen into the sere and yellow leaf. Even in Portugal, the priests could not hold their ground in opposition to the people, if the English Tories had not enabled the barbarian powers to press on France, to press on Spain, to press on Portugal, and so maintain them. The first time a timber slips in this 'House that Jack built,' it will be seen if it is not true.

The landlords have the Corn Laws; what else would they desire? Do they claim a monopoly of religion and quartern-loaves,—the prohibition of foreign faith as well as corn, by act of parliament? Their demand to limit men's religion in Ireland, is the out-post to their demand to limit men's food in other places; and to drive them from one first, is the plain road to driving them from the other afterwards.

I am not prepared, by my vote this night, to give notice to quit my present tenement, until I am sure of having another house over my head.—*Speech of Earl Bathurst, May 16, 1817.*—p. 70.

On this head also, in addition to the enactments of our present laws, we shall do well to bear in mind the plain policy and express provision of the famous edict of Nantes, which forbids the public exercise of any other than the dominant religion in our fleets and armies, a possible attempt in the present growth of Roman Catholic pretensions, and which no man who values the safety of the state, can contemplate without just alarm.—*Speech of Lord Colchester, June 21, 1822.*—p. 74.

Our Protestant ascendancy must be paramount, or we shall have, in no long time, a Catholic domination. Let us not deceive ourselves. These two claims to power are utterly incompatible, and irreconcilable.—*Id.* p. 76.

A conference was held respecting the bill for Occasional Conformity, and the lords who conducted it, had objected to a measure which subjected to the penalty of perpetual forfeiture of office those who were guilty of the crime of occasional conformity. At the conference they stated this important doctrine: 'The lords look on the fixing of the qualifications for places of trust to be a thing so entirely lodged within the legislature, that, without giving any reason for it, upon any apprehension of danger, however remote, every government may put such rules, restraints, or conditions on all who serve in any place of trust, as they

A. When the interests of the people and those of the priest lie the same way—when both of them are suffering under one common injustice—the priest has a power in rousing and directing the efforts of the people, against which the naked pecuniary influence of the landlord is as nothing. The case is the same that would take place, if the Protestant population of England were oppressed by the Roman Catholics, and Catholic landlords should try their hand at persuading them to vote against their clergy and their interest. In such circumstances the Protestant clergy would be 'brought to the fore,' and be of incalculable power; though on all common occasions they are ready enough to lament the little heed that is paid to their suggestions. It is not the priests that raise the storm, but

A. There is one thing worse than having no new house over your head,—and that is, having the old one fall upon it. The question may some morning be found settled in a way that it would be very unpleasant for noble lords to think upon; and what then becomes of noble lords coquetries, about not trying a new house too hastily.

A. This was said in 1822; and in 1828 the king's generals in Ireland were issuing directions, that when the Protestant and Catholic soldiers of a regiment attended their respective places of public worship at different hours, the Protestants should keep the arms of the regiment for the Catholics, and the Catholics for the Protestants. A good military comment on the wisdom of intolerant peers; and an argument for the soundness of the rest of their conclusions.

A. The tyrant's plea, necessity. If by ascendancy is meant the foolish plan of making one part of the horses drag the other, then it is true that there must always be an ascendancy one way, and that the only way to prevent its being against one side, is to make it against the other. But this necessity rests on nothing but the supposition, that men are foolish enough to insist on there being ascendancy instead of union.

A. The legislature may have a right to exclude from places of trust to which the appointment is with itself; but it has not a right to exclude from the legislature, for if it does this, it vitiates the source from which just legislation must proceed. If a number of merchants form a joint-stock company, they have a right to determine by a majority, if they can do so, that they will not employ a broker that is a Jew. But they have not a right to determine by a majority, that the Jews in the joint stock shall have no votes, lest they should give them to a Jew. The first is a legitimate exercise of the power that must be in all majorities. The other is an effort to compass and preserve a majority, of the same nature as if an existing majority in the House of Commons should proceed to secure themselves, by voting that the minority be forthwith expelled the House.

The Roman Catholics do fully admit, that they shall lie under all manner of incapacities, which a legislature constituted upon principles of justice, shall see fit to lay upon them. But they assert, that there is no justice in excluding them from their share in that legislature; and that to confound the two things together, is a fraud.

‘shall see cause for; but penalties and punishments are of another nature.’—*Parliamentary History*, vol. vi. p. 80.—*Speech of Mr. Peel*, Feb. 28, 1825.—p. 89.

Mr. Pitt told the House—
‘The persons excluded by the
‘Test Laws laboured under no
‘kind of stigma; but it was the
‘policy of private life, not to
‘allow any man to manage
‘your affairs, whose principles
‘you did not like; but the ex-
‘clusion of Dissenters could be
‘looked upon as no punish-
‘ment.’—*Id.* p. 91.

This was the interpretation of the treaty by the Whigs of that period; and what says the Whig historian? Bishop Burnet says—‘And thus ended the war of Ireland; and with that our civil war came to a final end. The articles of capitulation were punctually executed, and some doubts that arose out of some ambiguous words, were explained in favour of the Irish.’

I take, then, Sir, my meaning of the first article of the treaty of Limerick from the interpretation put on it by King William III.—I take it from the interpretation put on it by the Whigs of that time—and I take it from the Whig historian; and by them all it is held to mean, not political power or privileges, but freedom of religious worship. On this ground, then,—on these authorities—on Whig authorities, too—I feel myself bound to dissent from the assertions of the honourable baronet who opened this question.—*Speech of Mr. Peel*, March 5, 1827.—p. 105.

And my right honourable friend, the Attorney General for Ireland, (Plunkett) appealed to the House, as English gentlemen, if the people of England were, like the Roman Catholics of Ireland, excluded from political power, if they would not rise in arms for the recovery of their rights, and if they would not think themselves *justified* in rising in arms (hear),—aye, *justified* in the act of rising in arms against the laws; or, if they did not, if they would not think themselves unworthy of the name of Englishmen.

And, Sir, those gentlemen who advance these doctrines, which, above all, excite my apprehensions, do it, while they pronounce the exalted names, and profess to act on the principles of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Burke, who would have been the first to oppose such monstrous, such abominable doctrines—(cheers).—*Id.* p. 106.

‘With regard,’ Mr. Pitt said, ‘to the admission of Roman Catholics to franchises, to the elective franchise, or to any of those posts and offices which have been alluded to, I view all these points as distinctions to be given, not for the sake of the person and the individual who is to possess them, but for the sake of the public, for whose benefit they were created, and for whose advantage they are to be exercised. In all times, therefore, Sir, and upon every occasion, (continued Mr. Pitt,) whether relating to the Roman Catholic or Protestant Dissenter, to the people of Ireland, or to the people of England, I have always, from a due regard to the Constitution, been of opinion, that we are bound to consider, not merely what is desired by a part, but what is best and most advantageous for the whole.’—*Id.* p. 108.

This,—(continued the right honourable Secretary,)—this, Sir, is the principle on which I support the exclusion of the Roman Catholics (cheering). I would not make the Roman Catholic faith, or the religious

opinions of any man, a ground of exclusion against him merely on their account; but, Sir, I am

A. The fallacy is in the word ‘*your*.’ They are not ‘*your*’ affairs; they are ‘*your*’s and the other’s together.’ The intention is to argue in a circle,—‘The affairs are our’s, and therefore we exclude *you*; we exclude *you*, and therefore the affairs are our’s.’

If the members of the House of Commons chuse to determine that they will not have a Dissenter for their Speaker, or for chairman of a committee, they have a right to do it, and nobody can hinder them. But if by way of effecting this, they say they will expel the Dissenters from the House, it becomes quite another thing, and every body knows what to think of it.

A. The Whigs of that day are the very persons against whom suspicion lies, and therefore the last whose evidence should be brought in their own behalf. It is an odd fallacy that would neutralize the opinions of the friends of the Catholics *now*, by the opinions of their enemies a hundred and forty years ago, because both happen to rejoice in the name of Whigs.

A. The monstrous and abominable doctrine, that the people of England would think themselves justified in rising in arms, if they were excluded from political power like the Roman Catholics! But what says history,—what says the evidence of facts? That all the people of England have of settled government, is founded on the daily and hourly acknowledgment, that they *are* justified in rising in arms to prevent their being excluded like the Catholics. If not, why do not the sentries move off from the Horse Guards, and send for the King of Sardinia?

A. Let the whole consider what is best for the whole; but do not drive out a part from their share in the debate. It is precisely the difference between a majority’s hearing a minority and deciding their own way after all,—and their obtaining their purpose by decreeing that the minority shall be expelled.

A. The passage put in Italics conveys a perfectly good reason for a Protestant member’s conducting himself in a certain manner *in an open parliament*; but not for commencing his operations by voting the Catholic minority out of the House.

bound to consider, not only what they may suffer and what they may desire, but what will be good for the whole.—*Id.* p. 109.

I object, Sir, however, to the declaration contained in this petition, that it disagrees with the declaration sent forth by the Roman Catholic clergy. They state, that they publish it 'in the simplicity of truth, as the doctrines of the Catholic Church had been frequently misunderstood or misrepresented.' In the declaration published, in 1826, it is stated, that 'the Catholic Church, in common with all Christians, receives and respects the entire of the ten commandments, as they are found in Exodus and Deuteronomy; the only difference between them lying in some points of construction.' When I first read this passage, I exclaimed, 'Then I, and many other Protestants, have been long in error, for I have always understood that the Roman Catholics did not recognize the second commandment, but excluded it from their Catechism.'

But, Sir, it happened soon afterwards that a catechism of the Roman Catholic Church fell into my hands, and then I was able to appreciate the 'simplicity of truth' in which they had issued their declaration. This catechism, from which I am now about to read, is stated to have been revised by the Rev. Dr. Butler, and recommended by four Roman Catholic Archbishops; it is printed by the Roman Catholic printer to the Royal College of Maynooth, and is the twenty-fifth edition, carefully corrected. No doubt, Sir, therefore, can be attached to its authenticity. I turn to the Commandments, to correct my erroneous conceptions of the Roman Catholic system, and I find, that indeed the first Commandment is, in some respects, differently expressed, as compared with its appearance in Exodus and Deuteronomy. The second is, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;' and the number ten is made out in this manner,—the ninth is, 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife,' and the tenth, 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.' It would be infinitely better, Sir, and much more to my satisfaction, if my right honourable friend had not called my attention to this petition. And I cannot help regretting this additional proof of the incompatibility of the fact with the profession of the Roman Catholic Church, and that my first suspicion was correct, viz.—that these petitioners *did not* approach the House 'in the simplicity of truth.'

After this, Sir, let not my right honourable friend, for the future, challenge implicit confidence for any petition which he may present from that quarter. Whatever statements may accompany it, I shall regard them with suspicion. Their professed sentiments I, for one, must continue to contrast with their actual conduct: and in opposition to this sort of test, it is in vain to refer me to this or that letter from Dr. Doyle, or the declaration of Dr. Curtis, when some other letter, or some other declaration, from the same party, might be adduced, of a totally opposite character. They will never again mystify me. And I cannot avoid expressing my participation in that feeling of disgust, which insincerity and attempts to mislead always excite in the minds of the English people. (Loud cheering.)—*Id.* p. 125.

A. There can be no mistake in believing, that this is an averment that the Roman Catholics 'do not recognize the second commandment, but exclude it from their Catechism,'—and that they have been guilty of 'insincerity and an attempt to mislead,' by their declaration that they 'in common with all Christians, receive and respect the entire of the ten commandments as they are found in Exodus and Deuteronomy.'

Now see what quantity of accuracy and research is displayed, in the charge thus brought forward by a minister of state, as a reason for excluding many millions of the community from the benefit of equal laws.

What the Church of England prints in *two* paragraphs, under the titles of the first and second commandments, the Catholics and Lutherans print in *one*, and call the first. And they do it, they say, 'because it all relates to one and the same thing,'—the 'graven things' being only an explanation of what is meant by 'strange gods;' and they assert that the authority for it is as old as St. Augustine.

What the Church of England prints in *one* paragraph, and calls the tenth commandment, the Catholics and Lutherans print in *two*, under the titles of the ninth and tenth. And they do it, they say, because one prohibits the desire to break the sixth commandment, and the other the seventh,—and because they consider this as a more feasible distinction than the other. It is true they disturb the order of the Hebrew; but they think their reason sufficient to authorize it.

The Catholics *have* no composition under the exclusive title of 'their Catechism,' as the Church of England has; but on the contrary a multitude of works, the offspring of the zeal of different ecclesiastics, resembling in diversity of style and temperament, the elucidations of the Church of England's Catechism which are from time to time put forth by various divines. Some of these—amounting in the specimens collected to one in four—give only the heads of the commandments, on the ground of their being what are called 'short catechisms;' and in these, in consequence of the arrangement described, the words 'graven things' do not appear in sequence to the words 'strange gods.' But these shorter catechisms equally discuss the question of whether it is proper to 'pray to and serve images;' and even quote the remaining words of the commandment, though not in the precise place where the objector chuses to require them.

Upon such *lana caprina* as this, a minister of state declares his conviction of the necessity of harnessing the six horses to the rear; and men in the capacity of legislators, if the report is correct, receive him with loud cheering.—'The established pea-green slipper,' is a reasonable cause of quarrel, compared with that of the Secretary for the Home Department.

This, Sir, is the system upon which I have attempted to act with regard to Ireland. I have, on all occasions, endeavoured to do justice, and to give them the law.—*Id.* p. 198.

One fact is beyond the possibility of doubt. The Protestants are put on their defence. They have been reluctantly placed in that situation—they are the parties accused—they are charged with every species of intolerance, of religious bigotry, of oppression; and these charges are preferred against them by the Roman Catholic portion of the community and their advocates.—*Speech of Sir John Copley, March 5, 1827.*—p. 133.

Oppression, is every violence inflicted by a potential majority on the minority, which is not justified by the consideration of the common good. Dragging six horses out of twenty behind, is not for the common good; it therefore is oppression.

When it is said 'the Protestants' are put on their defence, it means the *dishonest* Protestants. The black sheep have no right to hide themselves in the flock and say 'We are all mutton alike.'

What is it that the Roman Catholics of Ireland ask? Indeed, they do not condescend to ask, but in terms the most emphatic and peremptory—in the language of menace, they demand of us what they call the restoration of their rights—their unconditional restoration.—*Id.* p. 151.

do for Portugal, but it will not do for England, to have a gown-and-cassock war, lest a man should find his way to vote, that the emoluments of the rich churchmen are five times greater than they ought to be. In the country of the beloved Ferdinand, men may be found to turn out for the priesthood; but the people of England will not fight in such a cause,—they positively are not fools enough. They will not go to war with the Irish, for the sake of what is to be got by oppressing them. To reduce the strength of undue power, is what they want themselves. Nine-tenths of the people of England have no voice or influence, directly or indirectly, in the government; and the consequence is, they are made to keep the others. The whole manufacturing interest is made to keep the agricultural one, because it is cut off from its due share in the representation. What all these, therefore, as sensible men, are bound to say to the Irish, is 'You help us, and we help you.' The struggle for fairness of representation in Ireland, is only the cause of the people of England tried under Irish names; and they are waiting for the decision of this question, before they proceed to their own.

Who is it that ever profits by oppression? Is it not always a pitiful minority? And why are you and I and every body, to go to expense and suffering, for the sake of securing the profits of oppression to a pitiful minority? Will it comfort us under an invasion of the tax-gatherer,—or for a son or brother left buried in a bog in Ireland,—to hear that it was for the interest of the church establishment? Half the people in England dislike the church establishment; and three-fourths of the remainder care nothing about it. The people of England want to live and to let live; and have no notion of being hounded away to cut the throats of their brethren in a civil war, for the sake of preserving the Irish clergy from the danger of being asked unpleasant questions in parliament.

In the first place, Sir, about what subjects are we in the habit of consulting in Parliament? What says the King's writ under the authority of which the House is convoked? We are summoned to consult on things and matters relating to the Constitution, and safety of the Protestant Church. By the measure now proposed, we are required

A. Law is not justice; it only ought to be. The very point in dispute is, whether the laws are just.

A. Most people who are put on their defence, are reluctantly placed in that situation. And it ordinarily happens, because they are accused. As a lawyer, the Master of the Rolls might have spared the tautology.

What is bigotry? What is intolerance? What is oppression?

Bigotry is not the believing that one kind of religion is true and another is not; or that one kind is better than another. This is the insidious sense; palmed on the world for the sake of confounding the absence of bigotry with indifference. But bigotry is believing that we have a right to rob and injure those who differ from us in religion. It is believing that difference in religious opinions removes the obligation of the moral rule, to 'do to others as we would they should do to us.'

Intolerance is bigotry in action. The two things stand to one another in the relation of 'faith and works.'

A. It is not the Roman Catholics of Ireland that ask. It is the sane part of the people of England; founding their claim on the dictates of common sense, and the plain rules of justice, which are always the rules of sound policy in the end. The truth will be told—THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND ARE NOT WITH THE OPPRESSORS. They say they will not have a civil war in Ireland, for the sake of fattening those they do not want to be fat. The people on this side the water have not forgotten Jefferies and Kirke, and Lauderdale and Dalzell; and they will not see their rule restored in the Westland provinces. The very whiskered dragoon at Ballinamore, said he did not like 'going out against the hill-folk.' It might

A. The Constitution, in the mouths of those who have any evil to defend, always means *existing wrongs*. It clearly means so here. The question is at once brought into a short compass,—Whether parliament assembles to discuss the interests of the community, or the interests of the Church of England and existing wrongs?

to admit into the legislature of the country, assembled to deliberate upon matters connected with the safety of the Church of England, a body of Roman Catholics, directly hostile to that Church—men who, upon principle, must be hostile to it in every respect.—*Id.* p. 153.

Now, Sir, I will entreat the House to recollect—and it is with sincere regret that I do so—that there are at the present moment, and have always been, many Protestant members of the House of Commons, who entertain views, and profess sentiments, of a nature hostile to the Established Church of these realms. If, in addition to the lukewarm friends, and avowed opponents, we throw into the scale another weight—if we add to this body another mass,—knowing as we do, that both will act with the same spirit, and make one common cause, shall we, I ask, be discharging our duty to the Church, of which we are members, and which we have pledged ourselves and are bound to support?—*Id.* p. 155.

Let me pause for a moment, Sir, upon this part of the subject, and let me suppose that there are returned to this House some of those persons who exhibit in themselves specimens of some of those talents, which seem to be indigenous to Ireland—let me suppose some of the individuals of that body to be desirous of overturning the Protestant Establishment, and of rearing in its stead the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland—let me suppose these persons possessed of talents, resembling in their extent and power those of my right honourable friend the Attorney General for Ireland, commanding and swaying the body they represent by their masterly eloquence and extraordinary powers, and directing that eloquence and those powers to the object to which I have referred. I ask, is this a light danger, and are we to treat it with contempt; or, are we not, to reserve in our own hands the most effectual means of defending ourselves from such a danger?—*Id.* p. 156.

With this mass of information, Sir, it will not be difficult to discover the exact effect which the Roman Catholic disabilities produce upon the Roman Catholic population; and I was greatly surprised to hear from such competent witnesses as Mr. O'Connell, Dr. Doyle, and Dr. Kelly, how very little the great body of the people is affected by the disqualifying laws. That the greatest wretchedness exists amongst them, is beyond doubt: that poverty, that want of employment, insubordination, distrust in all the established institutions of the country, fraud, perjury, and immorality, arising from that distrust, exist to a frightful extent, is beyond all doubt; but that Roman Catholic emancipation is the cure for these evils, or one which is regarded by the peasantry in any other light than the gratification of religious bigotry, is what these gentlemen have not ventured to assert.—*Speech of George Robert*

A. Arguments of this kind amount to an avowal, that the Church of England is unpopular, and cannot be supported but by confining the exercise of government to her friends;—that if the power of interference were in the nation at large, she would be pulled down;—in other words, that the nation in the aggregate is her enemy. The policy of such avowals may be doubted; but those who call themselves her friends are answerable.

A. What is this but saying, that the Church of England has no chance of standing, except by preventing the talents of her opponents from having a hearing;—that half-a-dozen men in the House of Commons as clever as the Attorney General for Ireland, would talk her down in a twelvemonth. Now if she is as rickety as this, what chance is there of her standing at all?—the scale is turned against her, and men will begin to take the rising side.

A. The way to discover 'the exact effect,' is to see what the effect would be on the Protestant population of England, if they were put into the place of the Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholics into theirs.

The people of England would then not be long in finding out, that such an oppression had exactly the effect of the distinction of colours arising out of the existence of slavery in the West Indies;—that it penetrated into all ranks and relations of life;—that it met the rich in the enjoyment of his riches, and the poor in the endurance of his poverty;—and that to trifle about its removal not removing all ills and filling up all wants, is like urging that the abolition of negro slavery would not give every man of colour an annuity in the three per cents. Like the negroes, they would say, 'Take off the 'unjust distinction that presses on us like a red-hot iron; and 'then leave us to take care of ourselves. We do not ask you 'to remove our wretchedness, but our degradation. We come 'for justice, not for charity. We complain that we are slaves, 'not that we are paupers.'

When men 'distrust all the established institutions of their 'country,' there is but one inference,—that the institutions do them harm. To blame them for it, is as irrational as to blame them for complaining when a shoe pinches. It is the shoe, not the man, that wants altering.

But, Sir, when I consider the position of the two parties; when I consider the declarations which have been made, and the signs which have been given, I can never expect that the two parties will amalgamate together. The Protestants are in possession of

A. It is admitted here distinctly, that the contest is for 'the 'possession of all that is valuable in Ireland,'—for 'the estates that, no matter whether rightly or wrongfully, have been wrested from the Roman Catholics,'—for the 'emolument and honour' arising out of 'the establishments of the country,'—for the 'splendid provision' of the church, and the 'station and power and influence' of the corporations. In short that the Protestants in Ireland have a great mass of occupation,

all that is valuable in Ireland; their estates, no matter whether rightly or wrongfully, have been wrested from the Roman Catholics. The establishments of the country conferring emolument and honour, are all Protestant; the Church conferring a splendid provision upon its ministers, and the corporations giving station and power and influence to its members, are all Protestant, and have all, at no distant period, been in possession of Roman Catholics.—*Id.* p. 172.

Is it possible therefore to think, Sir, that all the solid advantages can be on one side, without exciting a hope of enjoyment on the other? Can Protestants and Roman Catholics really unite together when such tempting objects are open to the Roman Catholics, and when a public clamour has already been begun against the Protestants? Will the Roman Catholic be satisfied to see every Protestant institution rolling in wealth and splendour, whilst his own are in poverty and distress? Will he submit to have his churches, his convents, his schools, his colleges, supported by alms, whilst his Protestant rival revels in the enjoyment of Roman Catholic possessions? Human nature forbids us to think so; and I must do the Roman Catholics the justice to say, that they have been no hypocrites on this occasion, but have proclaimed boldly and naturally their expectations.—*Id.*

The object of the petition, my lords, couched in very decent and moderate terms, is, nevertheless, of great size and importance. It is no less than a request on the part of the Roman Catholics, to legislate for a Protestant country, to dispense the laws, to command the armies and navies, and to take share in the executive councils of a Protestant kingdom: a request that strikes at the principles of the Revolution, and by plain, broad, and inevitable consequences, calls into question the justice and policy of the Act of Settlement.—*Speech of the Archbishop of Canterbury, May 13, 1805.*—p. 201.

I insist, my lords, that I am as sincerely attached to the genuine principles of toleration as any one of your lordships. I consider it as the brightest ornament and fairest grace of the Reformed Church which is established in this kingdom: but I cannot prevail upon myself to confound toleration with equality, much less with power and eventual superiority.—*Id.*

But, my lords, let us examine the meaning of those words, 'debarred of their civil,' or, as some have said, 'their natural rights.' Is there any civil right which individual citizens may not be called upon to forego, if public expediency demands the sacrifice? Is not this a principle, which, in some shape or other, must be recognized under every imaginable form of civil government?—*Speech of the Bishop of Chester, May 17, 1825.*—p. 210.

A. The upshot of all this is to ask, whether any set of men will be wronged if they can help it. The argument is founded entirely on the wrongs being palpable and notorious, and on the certainty that no man submits to a wrong longer than he is obliged to do it.

The answer of the English people to this must be, that they were not made to be bottle-holders to the Irish Protestants, in a struggle which is avowed to be unjust. That they will not let the Irish Protestants be trodden to pieces in the crowd; but will not be made a cat's-paw, to prevent a fair hearing of the case against them in the House of Commons.

What is it to the people of England, that an Irish Protestant shall 'revel in the enjoyment of Roman Catholic possessions,' and be able to oppress three out of four of all the men he meets? And why is an Englishman to pay in his purse or his person, for upholding such a state of things? Englishmen pay enough for upholding different kinds of slavery already. They pay upon every spoon-full of sugar they eat, for upholding the flogging of women in Jamaica; and there is no reason why they should pay for oppression in Ireland besides.

A. Their request is not to legislate, but to have their share in legislation;—it is not in a Protestant country, but in a country that is part Protestant and part Catholic;—it is not to dispense the laws, but to be a portion of the dispensers;—it is not to command the armies and navies, but to have a share in the command where nobody objects that they shall fight. The fallacy throughout, is in confounding a demand for a just share, with a demand for the whole.

A. Nobody confounds toleration with equality;—for the great question is, why there should be toleration and not equality. Toleration is the condescension of a prudent despot, who yields one half to secure the other. And the difficulty afloat in men's minds is, why there should be a despot at all;—what reason can be given for it, that may not be given for the despotism of any collection of men who are able to overpower a traveller on the high road.

If, after every body is heard, the majority come to a determination that is disagreeable to the minority, there is no help for it but in the gradual developement of the truth, that all injustice is unprofitable in the end. But what is called for here is, that people shall suffer and *shall not be heard*; and that the reason why they shall not be heard is, that if they were heard they would cease to suffer.

A. The proof lies upon the 'if.' But what is attempted to be proved in this case, is only that it is expedient for the church and the Irish Protestants.

It seems to me, my lords, I confess, to be as unjust, in the abstract, to exclude a man from the legislature for want of a certain amount of property, as it is, to hold him disqualified, on account of certain opinions which affect the integrity and security of the commonwealth.

—*Id.*

The oath and declaration, my lords, which it is the object of these bills to repeal, were intended to exclude Roman Catholics from offices of trust and profit, because the principles of their church were held to be inconsistent with the safety and tranquillity of the State. My lords, those principles are precisely the same now, as they were at the enactment of the oath and declaration; it is the boast of that church that they are so. Persons, therefore, professing those principles, are as inadmissible to offices of trust and profit now, as they were formerly.—*Speech of the Bishop of Salisbury, July 9, 1823.*—p. 226.

With my countrymen, my lords, I most decidedly concur; but, at the same time, feel it necessary to stand forward as an advocate of emancipation, though not exactly for the description of persons who have been for so many years urging claims hostile to the Constitution, in no very qualified terms. No, my lords, those for whom I would claim this boon, are the Protestants of Ireland, who, I do not hesitate to affirm, are at this moment the most oppressed portion of the British subjects; in fact, they are a proscribed people; and if very strong measures are not adopted for their relief and security, all that are capable must leave the country, and we may expect to hear that the remainder have been annihilated in one way or another.—*Speech of Lord Lorton, February 23, 1827.*—p. 244.

‘Can your lordship, laying your hand on your breast, appeal to your conscience and honour, and then say that the Irish Church establishment requires no reform. It is impossible that you could, my lord, because it is monstrous to think of an annual income, amounting to several millions sterling, being appropriated in such a country as Ireland, to the maintenance of the pastors of less than one-thirtieth part of the population; laying aside all notice of the laws by which this revenue is protected and collected, their partial nature, the mode of administering them, and the character of the agents by whom they are executed.’—*Extract from the Letter of Dr. Doyle, as quoted in the Speech of Lord Lorton.*—*Id.* p. 251.

Those who support the bill ask, ‘What danger can be apprehended from a few Roman Catholic members?’ The number likely to be returned is de-

A. Propping one rotten thing by another. Nobody believes that the exclusions from the legislature here appealed to, are any thing but the trick of one party to carry things their own way.

But besides this, there may be no justice in the comparison. The exclusion from parliament for want of property, may be one that very little affects the class professed to be excluded; or it may be one that in practice is evaded, and amounts to no exclusion at all. Make it as easy for a Catholic to get into parliament, as for a man who has not 300*l.* a year in land; and the Catholics will be content.

A. Bad logic, even without contesting any of the premises. For it omits the principal element, which is, whether the *times and circumstances* are such, as to make the exclusion as necessary now, as at the enactment of the oath and declaration.

A. All oppressors, by their own story, are an injured race. The West-Indian planters, if their own account of themselves be taken, are the most oppressed portion of the British subjects; and all the mischief arises from certain turbulent blacks, who will not lie still and be flogged.

Contrast this with the declaration *on the same side* by the member for Derry (pp. 11, 12), that ‘the Protestants are in possession of all that is valuable in Ireland,’—‘the establishments of the country conferring enolument and honour, are all Protestant,’—‘the church conferring a splendid provision upon its ministers, and the corporations giving station and power and influence to its members, are all Protestant, and have all, at no distant period, been in possession of Roman Catholics.’ Contrast these, and say whether the allegation of suffering is any thing, but the outcry of men fearing to lose what they know they unjustly possess.

A. This is what the opponents of the Catholics are imprudent enough to allude to in their speeches. And here is the secret of what they call the oppression of the Protestants. They fear for the ‘costly Meat Establishment.’

‘But, how is this?’ I wondering cried,
As I walked that city fair and wide;
And saw in every marble street,
A row of beautiful butchers’ shops.
‘What means, for men who don’t eat meat,
This grand display of loins and chops?’
In vain I asked—’twas plain to see
That nobody dared to answer me.

MOORE’S *City of Hindostan.*

A. Twenty-four members can only carry a great question, when half the rest of the House, *minus* twenty-three, are on the same side. There is a perilous struggle between justice and injustice *upon other points*; and the Tories cannot stand the chance of what might be effected by twenty-four.

scribed as exceedingly limited—*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. But I will remind the House, that twenty-four members may carry a great question.—*Speech of Sir C. Wetherell, March 23, 1821.*—p. 266.

Such is the opinion of every respectable writer on the subject—with one exception—I allude to Dr. Paley, who observes, that Roman Catholics and Protestants may meet in Parliament in as friendly a manner as if they assembled to discuss questions of history or philosophy. Now, I cannot conceive that Protestants and Roman Catholics could meet in Parliament in precisely the same way as if they assembled to form a *hortus siccus*, or to discuss some point relative to the natural history of birds, beasts, and fishes.—*Id.* p. 269.

Attempts, Sir, have already been made to invade the property of the Church, and particularly the possessions attached to it in Ireland. The honourable member for Montrose (Hume), whose activity would prevent him from letting slip any advantage that may offer for effecting that system of reduction of which he is the advocate, would find his efforts countenanced and fortified by Roman Catholic members, who could not be expected to have any other feelings than those of hostility against the Church Establishment. It is impossible to foresee what might be the success of a renewal of those attempts which have been hitherto defeated, when they should be backed by the influence to which I allude.—*Speech of the Right Honourable Henry Goulburn, April 21, 1825.*—p. 278.

It may be asked, why should difference of religious opinions produce political discord? It is sufficient to answer, that it always has produced that effect—that it produces it at the present moment—and that until human nature is altered, and man, under the lights of the new philosophy, shall cease to be a religious animal, it will probably continue to produce the same effect, and to be made (as it has been termed) a stepping-stone to ambition, and to the acquisition of political power.—*Speech of Sir John Nicholl, Feb. 3, 1812.*—p. 289.

Notwithstanding these misrepresentations, the great body [of the Irish] is attached to the empire, and not disposed to separate from Great Britain, or to unite themselves to France; they promptly and gallantly enter our fleets and armies; nay, it is frequently asserted in this House, that they fight the battles of the country, even beyond their proportionate numbers.—*Id.*

The love of power is universal. The Protestants equally possess it. They have the ascendancy—they have it justly; not only by the laws of the constitution, but as being four-fifths of the population of the empire.—*Id.* p. 294.

Perseverance, however, is threatened. Can the Roman Catholics suppose that, upon a subject so vitally important to the best interests of the nation, the legislature will be teased into acquiescence by importunity? still less, that it will be overawed by menace? certainly not. It is only by a reference to the reason and conviction of Parliament that they have any prospect of success to their application.—*Id.* 295.

A. The Protestants and Roman Catholics cannot meet in a friendly manner, to discuss the means by which one of them may be oppressed. But they may meet to arrange all the just and desirable operations of government; one of the first characteristics of which is, that *nobody* shall be oppressed.

A. The Roman Catholic members of the House of Commons would be very likely to join Mr. Hume in 'effecting that system of reduction of which he is the advocate.' Which is a good reason why all who rob the public should try to prevent their entrance; and why every other man in England should desire it.

A. Under the influence of philosophy—or in other words, of the love of common sense, as it has been operating from the beginning of things to the present hour—man *has* ceased to be a religious animal, in the meaning in which the term is here employed. He has ceased to be an animal disposed to quarrel and fight for religion;—in the same way that he has ceased to be disposed to quarrel and fight for property. He has found out that there is a better way for all parties,—*justice*.

A. But they call for an army of thirty thousand men in Ireland; which Englishmen pay for. It is here that the six horses are dragging to the rear.

A. Four men have no right to rob *one* because they are four. It may be a just reason why they should have four-fifths of the common stock; but not why they should have it all.

The Protestants have a right to have a majority in parliament; but not to oust the minority from parliament. It must be an extraordinary head that does not perceive the difference.

A. All good things come by perseverance. The Catholics know that the *fluxion* of public opinion is in their favour. They know that the people of England are coming over to their side, and finding out that themselves and the Catholics are suffering from the same source—an overbearing oligarchy, determined to keep what they have, and to have what they can. And therefore they reasonably persevere.

All justice comes by fear. It comes by the apprehension of what may happen if it is refused. It comes, in short, by prudence; and prudence is only fear looking through a high-power telescope. The friends of the Catholics wish to produce a conviction that it is *prudent*, to take off the six horses from the rear.

The principle of the measure concedes the right of admissibility to every office in the country, as belonging to every person of every sect. This is a principle somewhat similar to that which is held by individuals who contend for the radical doctrines of universal suffrage and annual parliaments—doctrines which I am convinced my right honourable friend holds in utter detestation.—*Speech of Mr. Bankes, March 16, 1821.*—p. 349.

The enemies of justice have a great habit of supporting *infirmum per infirmus*. 'If you, Sir, believe *this* is an abuse and ought to be removed, you must believe *this other* is an abuse and ought to be removed,—which it is certain you must hold in utter detestation.'

What is a 'radical'? One that 'has the root of the matter in him.' One that knows his ills, and goes the way to remove them. The Whigs of 1688 were radicals; and so is every man that shuts his mouth to keep out flies.

In our days things are altered. The Whigs are nobody. They cry for the toy, and can do nothing with it when they get it. At all events they only stand for what they may count; and nobody expects of them any more. The theory of a government like ours is, that the friends of abuses shall hold the reins, and be made to drive whither they would not;—that it shall be Prospero with Caliban for his coachman. And there is no leek they will not eat if they are obliged to it; the only question is how to collect a force of opinion, that shall make them apply themselves to their meal.

There was no more probability of a Whig ministry removing the Test Act, than of their removing Mont Blanc. The only chance they have for office again is, if the Tories should find the battle going too sore for them, and put in the Whigs for a wool-sack to turn shot. Half the Whigs are become Radicals; and the other half are following as fast as they can. So that unless the Tories make haste, there will be nobody to try the experiment on.

When parliament grants concessions, we are only building up steps by which the Roman Catholics will endeavour to reach at greater immunities. Can the right honourable gentleman imagine, that the exclusion from honours, distinctions, and offices, in which only a few of the Roman Catholic population can hope to participate, would have the effect of inflaming all Ireland, from one end to the other, and yet, that a system which touches their property—which affects that, the slightest interference with which every man is alive to—would create no irritation of feeling? Would they take no step to remove what they must necessarily look on as a material grievance? Would they not consider it a great injury to be subjected to the maintenance of a church which they hold in abhorrence? If they would not, they must be men of a different description from those born in any other country. Does the right honourable gentleman believe, that this settlement can be fixed permanently—that it can be made to last for ever?—*Id.* p. 351.

In the next place, can such a change be desired by the Protestants who Dissent from the Established Church, after that casual bond is dissolved which recently united them with the Roman Catholics, in pursuit of an object which, so far as regards the Dissenters, no longer exists? *Speeches upon the Roman Catholic Claims, by Charles Lord Colchester. June 10th, 1828.*—p. 99.

Gentlemen! The alliance between Popery and Liberalism is no new event. Every one of the measures which cost King James the 2nd his Crown, were

A. If the principle of the measure is as demonstrably sound as the principle of universal suffrage and annual parliaments,—there may be no saying in what *Anno Domini* men will arrive at the comprehension of it, but there is no doubt of their coming to it in the end. In truth the principles are one and the same; being only part of the general demonstration, that when all have suffrage, then and not till then, property of all kinds has its due influence. This is the 'Newtonian Theory' of politics; the most important, and the last. The present system is a shuffle to keep undue power in the hands of the landowners, that they may make the others keep them. When the manufacturing and commercial interests find out, that universal suffrage would make every man keep himself,—then comes the tug of war.

The objections to annual parliaments, every body knows, are like the reasoning of the boy that combed his hair once in seven years, and wondered how people bore it that combed it every day.

The Whigs are nobody. They cry for the toy, and can do nothing with it when they get it. At all events they only stand for what they may count; and nobody expects of them any more. The theory of a government like ours is, that the friends of abuses shall hold the reins, and be made to drive whither they would not;—that it shall be Prospero with Caliban for his coachman. And there is no leek they will not eat if they are obliged to it; the only question is how to collect a force of opinion, that shall make them apply themselves to their meal.

There was no more probability of a Whig ministry removing the Test Act, than of their removing Mont Blanc. The only chance they have for office again is, if the Tories should find the battle going too sore for them, and put in the Whigs for a wool-sack to turn shot. Half the Whigs are become Radicals; and the other half are following as fast as they can. So that unless the Tories make haste, there will be nobody to try the experiment on.

A. Will things as they are last for ever? If the 'grievance' is such that nobody will tolerate it when mended, how small is the chance of its being tolerated now.

A. The Dissenters have shown themselves honest men and wise—quite fit to be trusted in the streets without either a keeper or a police officer. Not an individual that was touched by the Test Act, has turned against the Catholics—or shown the common disposition of mankind, to kick down the ladder by which themselves have risen. The Dissenters know that the great security for the freedom of their respective sects, is in the freedom of every body else. They have very little apprehension from the Catholics; but they are desperately afraid of Lord Colchester and his fellows.

A. James the 2nd was the fag end of an old party in the government, whose well-known object was, to establish a Catholic ascendancy, by fair means or by foul. There is no such danger now. And therefore, what was a clear fraud in one case, may be nothing like it in the other.

01 measures taken in the names of liberty of conscience, and the removal of political distinctions on account of religious differences; but, our ancestors knew that, while he talked of toleration, his ultimate aim was really persecution.—*Address to the Freeholders of the County of Kent, by Lord Bexley. Oct. 25, 1828.*

Hear what a Protestant Dissenter says to his brethren, and judge what probability there is of their dancing as Lord Colchester may pipe.

‘But our rule of judgment is plain: persecution can never suppress error, nor advance truth. If a man’s civil situation is made better by the belief of certain dogmas, or is made worse upon their denial,—you tempt him by a bribe, you intimidate him by a penalty. Both instances are of the very essence of persecution. Nothing is left to evidence: nothing rested on conviction. The Catholic is politically deprived on the sole account of speculative religious opinion. He is wrong: allow it: endeavour to undeceive his fallacies, to rectify his mistakes. By what weapon by depressing his secular condition? by pointing at him as unworthy of confidence? Truth is no alliance with force, with proscription, with scorn. It only calls the power of reason and persuasion to its aid. This is the first principle of Protestant dissent. Not ignorant of such miseries ourselves, we have learnt to rescue the miserable. Let the sentiments of men be most fanatical, they owe their account for them to God. If men do what is contrary to right, what is destructive to society, let the strong arm of the law punish them. But thoughts are not subjects, nor are theories crimes.’—*Letter on Catholic Emancipation, by the Rev. R. W. Hamilton, of Leeds, p. 4.*

‘Seek peace, shun faction, preserve charity: but remember that every attempt to resist the liberty of others cannot be indifferent to you, must not find you neutral: *it is a threatening demonstration against your own.*’—p. 11.

This is one of the sufferers who have been dragged behind the carriage themselves, till like Sterne’s negro girl, by feeling oppression they have learnt mercy. There is nothing to make men good Christians, like a community of suffering.

Among all the opponents of the Catholics, the feeblest are the interpreters of prophecy. All men find every body they hate, in the book of the Revelation. The Westminster Reviewer would be a vial or a trumpet, if it could only make itself of sufficient magnitude in the eyes of its enemies. The Protestant discovers the man of sin to be the pope. The Catholic with equal assurance believes him to be heresy. And Mr. Thomas Parkin,* with as good shew of reason as the rest, declares him to be religious and civil despotism all over the earth. But waiving all question concerning the accuracy of their interpretation, how do the prophetic party in the House of Commons (for there is one) proceed to argue? They say they find it written, that the Catholics shall over-run the earth. And therefore they will vote against the Catholic relief. Now if they know that it is to be, what use is there in the way they take to hinder it—and how do they know that the way they take, *may not be the very way in which the thing is to be brought about?* Suppose it should turn out, that oppression ends in giving the Catholic an ascendancy, as it has already for one period given it to the Protestants. In such a consummation, how would the interpreters of prophecy excuse themselves, for having despised the greater prophet who said to them ‘Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you?’ Why are their own constructions of the visions of Patmos, to supersede the plain declaration of the Teacher of Nazareth? Let us do justly; and let prophecy take care of itself. If the Protestants are to go to the wall, to the wall they will go; but it is clear that it is not written that they are to escape it by the commission of injustice.

The cause of the Catholics and religious liberty, on the whole, is going forward as its best friends would wish. The only chance of its opponents seems to be in provoking some Catholic to tread on a Protestant’s toe, and so superseding the danger of discussion by the din of war. To this end they may be expected to bend all their skill; and the Catholics on their part will be as zealous to prevent them. When one side wants nothing but to see the knave of clubs, it is hard if the other does not contrive to keep it in his hand. All moderate men in England sigh to see the game brought to an end. All moderate men in Ireland, sigh ten times more. The ten horns, and the little horn—are nothing in comparison of peace, and a Christian-like act of parliament. There has been mischief enough with these ‘horned nowt’ already; men want now to make trial of mercy instead of sacrifice, and to give up the dark glass of prophecy, for what it has pleased God to make the broad day-light of justice and common sense.

* An Exposure of Religious and Civil Despotism, in Observations on the Prophecies, &c., by Thomas Parkin.—Wightman and Cramp, 24, Paternoster Row. 1828.

FINIS.

HANDBOUND
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS

